

REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the non-Final Office Action mailed on February 27, 2004. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-13 and 15-16 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-13, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,055,313) in view of Gay et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2,092,966) and Hutzenlaub (U.S. Patent No. 4,117,986). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Yamaguchi discloses a roll slitting and rewinding machine. Contrary to the Examiner's rejection in the Office Action, Yamaguchi does not teach reeling the full-width paper web around a spool in a first reel-up. The configuration shown in Fig. 2 clearly shows that several rolls 12 are wound simultaneously from a full-width web which is slitted into strips 11 (col. 2, lines 16-19). Yamaguchi also does not teach reeling a full width web around a single reel spool.

Hutzenlaub teaches a troller cutting and winding machine where a full width paper web is not reeled. The machine includes a cutting device 21 having longitudinal cutting blades. From the paper web, strips are cut longitudinally and are passed via deflecting and supporting roll 4 alternately to winding-on stations 3 (col. 4, lines 15-20). As such, several paper webs are wound simultaneously on several cores.

Winding a single roll at a time on several rolls simultaneously belong to different phases of paper web handling, and a man skilled in the art of papermaking can not consider one single roll or a number of rolls apparent alternatives to each other for economical and technological reasons. Winding only one roll at a time in machines of Yamaguchi and Hutzenlaub would mean either of the two alternatives: 1) winding one customer roll of usual width (narrower than a reel made of full-width web corresponding to the production width), which would mean that all the rest of the full-width web discharged from the reel is not wound and wasted (economically unacceptable); or 2) winding a full width web resulting in a wide roll which is unsuitable to the machine constructions, which can not be handled by the roll handling system, and which can not be shipped to the customer (technologically unacceptable).

Also, both the machine of Yamaguchi and Hutzenlaub are comparable only to the machines denoted "AL" in the figures of the present application which are so-called slitter-winders where a full-width paper web is discharged from a reel and slitted longitudinally into narrower webs or strips, which are simultaneously wound around their respective cores to form several so-called customer rolls and then shipped from the paper mill to customers. The machine is at the very end of the production lines as compared to being a first reel-up or a second one (reel-up). Therefore, Yamaguchi and Hutzenlaub do not relate to the initial stages of handling paper web where full-width paper web is reeled around one single reel spool at a time, as in the present invention.

As previously argued by the Applicant, Gay discloses that a non-woven fibrous sheet is split along its plane during the processing of the sheet, thus resulting in two different webs and

consequently in two separate wound rolls after the point of slitting. This method may only applied to relatively thick sheets and low production speeds, because otherwise the web would easily break. Furthermore, to achieve the advantages described in the Gay patent, the web needs impregnation treatment. In modern papermaking technology the production speeds are high and the grammages can be fairly low, both factors contradicting the idea presented in the Gay patent. Thus, the Gay patent teaches away from the present invention, because it presents a solution that can not be applied in the field of the present invention.

In Applicant's present claims, the web to be wound in sequential winding stations is defined as a "full-width paper web". It is clearly mentioned that, although there is a plurality of first reel spools and a plurality of second reel spools, the first reeling and (after the subsequent unwinding) the following reeling of a full-width web takes place around one of the plurality of first reel spools and around one of the plurality of second reel spools, respectively. Thus, in the present invention, the process of using several reel spools is serial rather than parallel (simultaneous).

The Applicant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Yamaguchi that would lead one to combine the teachings of that reference with the disclosures of Hutzenlaub and Gay. Also, the references cannot be combined. The rolls as disclosed in Yamaguchi are final products sent to the customers, and can not be further finished. Therefore, they cannot be further finished by the of Hutzenlaub and Gay. There is no hint or suggestion that this combination would be beneficial, necessary or even desired. Accordingly, absent some motivation, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the invention of Yamaguchi with the disclosures of Gay and Hutzenlaub.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that even if the three references were combined, the result would not be the present invention.

Accordingly, the Applicant asserts that claims 1, 3-9, 11-13, 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited prior art. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above argument it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome and should be removed and the present application should now be in condition for allowance. The Applicant notes that there is no indication that the drawings are acceptable. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide the status of the drawings in the next formal communication.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

This Response is accompanied by a petition for a three-month extension of time together with the requisite fee. In the event that any other fee is required for the entry of this Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By: Dona C. Edwards
Dona C. Edwards
Reg. No. 42,507

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 768-3800